

UNITED STATES DISTRICT  
COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF  
ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

SIA HENRY, *et al.*, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BROWN UNIVERSITY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 22-cv-00125

Hon. Matthew F. Kennelly

**PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION TO EXTEND TIME FOR PLAINTIFFS TO FILE A MOTION AGAINST DEFENDANT MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY REGARDING THE OVER-DESIGNATION OF DOCUMENTS AS  
“ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY”**

Plaintiffs move the Court for a short extension of time, from July 11, 2023 to July 21, 2023, for Plaintiffs to file a motion against Defendant Massachusetts Institute of Technology (“MIT”) in connection with MIT’s designation of documents as “Attorneys Eyes Only” (“AEO”). Plaintiffs have contended that MIT has over-designated documents as AEO and MIT has contended that it is working diligently to reduce the number of AEO-designated documents. Plaintiffs have consulted with MIT, and MIT does not oppose this motion.

At the last status conference, the Court set July 11, 2023 as the deadline by which Plaintiffs were to file a motion with respect to Defendants’ over-designation of documents as AEO. At present, Plaintiffs have largely resolved the AEO issues with each of the other Defendants, after many fruitful discussions regarding those Defendants’ excessive AEO designations. Plaintiffs contend that each Defendant other than MIT was able to get the

designations down to a number whereby the Confidentiality Order provisions to challenge individual documents is now manageable.

Plaintiffs continue to be in active discussions with MIT, which has a higher proportion of its documents designated AEO relative to other Defendants. However, MIT is still in the process of de-designating documents, which MIT advises will take several more days. Thus, Plaintiffs need more time to assess the outcome of those de-designations and to continue its discussions with MIT before determining whether it would be necessary to file any motion with regard to the over-designation of MIT documents as AEO. Pursuant to Rule 16(b)(4) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, there is good cause to modify the deadline previously set by the Court.

As a result, Plaintiffs seek an extension of time, until the close of business on July 21, 2023, to file a motion against MIT regarding AEO designations, if necessary, with any opposition brief to be due as the Court directs.

Dated: July 11, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Robert D. Gilbert  
Robert D. Gilbert  
Elpidio Villarreal  
Robert S. Raymar\*  
Sarah Schuster  
Alexis Marquez  
Steven Magnusson  
**GILBERT LITIGATORS & COUNSELORS, P.C.**  
11 Broadway, Suite 615  
New York, New York 10004  
Phone: (646) 448-5269  
rgilbert@gilbertlitigators.com  
pdvillarreal@gilbertlitigators.com  
rraymar@gilbertlitigators.com  
sschuster@gilbertlitigators.com  
amarquez@gilbertlitigators.com

/s/ Edward J. Normand  
Devin “Vel” Freedman  
Edward J. Normand  
Peter Bach-y-Rita  
FREEDMAN NORMAND  
FRIEDLAND LLP  
99 Park Avenue  
Suite 1910  
New York, NY 10016  
Tel: 646-970-7513  
vel@fnf.law  
tnormand@fnf.law  
pbachyrita@fnf.law

/s/ Robert E. Litan  
Daniel J. Walker  
Robert E. Litan

smagnusson@gilbertlitigators.com

*\*Pro hac vice*

Hope Brinn  
BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel: 202-559-9745  
rlitan@bm.net  
dwalker@bm.net  
hbrinn@bm.net

Eric L. Cramer  
Caitlin G. Coslett  
Ellen Noteware  
BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
1818 Market Street, Suite 3600  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Tel.: 215-875-3000  
ecramer@bm.net  
ccoslett@bm.net  
enoteware@bm.net

Richard Schwartz  
BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
1720 W Division  
Chicago, IL 60622  
Tel: 773-257-0255  
rschwartz@bm.net

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*